

ONDE AND ENVY: A DIACHRONIC COGNITIVE APPROACH<sup>1</sup>

ANNA HEBDA

ADAM MICKIEWICZ UNIVERSITY, POZNAŃ

The present paper offers a comparative analysis of a native Middle English emotion term *onde* < OE *anda* and its French-derived counterpart *envy* from the point of view of diachronic cognitive linguistics. The contextual analysis of the lexemes in question has been conducted on the basis of data from the Middle English part of *The Helsinki corpus of English texts: Diachronic and dialectal* and a selection of 41 Middle English texts representing different dialect continua. It is claimed that the overlap in the conceptualisation of the lexemes in question contributed to the expansion of the loan at the expense of the native term. The design of the study follows that of Fabiszak – Hebda (2007).

*Keywords:* Middle English; *onde*; *envy*; diachronic emotionology; emotion talk; Conceptual Metaphor Theory

1. Introductory remarks

1.1. What makes an emotion?

Emotions are part and parcel of our lives and every human being is bound to experience them at one time or another. What may come as a surprise, then, is the degree of difficulty inherent in defining the concept, given how easy it is sometimes to identify fear, anger, love and the like.

The theories or typologies of emotions can be broadly grouped into feeling and cognitive approaches (see Zinck – Newen 2008 for the criticism thereof). The former, represented by James (1884), Lange (1885), Zajonc (1980), Damasio (1994) or LeDoux (1996), see emotions as resulting from perceived bodily changes. In James's (1884) view, emotion is the feeling of the bodily changes induced by the perception of an exciting or disturbing fact, disembodied emotion being nonexistent (1884: 190, 193). The latter, their main proponents being Solomon (1976), Lyons (1980), Marks (1982), and Oatley (1992), stress the role

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank prof. Hans-Jürgen Diller for his suggestions concerning the classification of emotions and prof. Małgorzata Fabiszak for her invaluable comments on earlier drafts of this paper. The faults which remain are entirely mine.

of the so-called “propositional attitudes”, seeing one’s beliefs and value judgments pertaining to particular situations as central to emotions.

Both feeling and cognitive approaches have been criticised for a number of shortcomings. Zinck and Newen (2008: 3), for example, point to the inability of the feeling theories to account for unconscious emotions (those whose presence shows in a physiological arousal unregistered by the experiencer) and to the necessity of there being the object of the emotion where complex emotions, such as shame or embarrassment, come into play. The theories termed “cognitive”, on the other hand, seem to disregard the fact that in some species (and young children, for that matter) certain (basic) emotions can occur without any beliefs or desires accompanying them (Zinck – Newen 2008: 4).

In the present paper, after Zinck and Newen (2008: 1, 7-10), emotions are viewed as a subtype of mental phenomena (next to perceptions, basic mental dispositions, felt body-states and cognitive attitudes) “determined by their functional roles”, which share the following properties:

- a) automatic appraisal that is tuned to: quick onset, brief duration, and typically unbidden occurrence
- b) distinctive physiognomic and physiological reactions
- c) distinctive cognitions: thoughts, memories, images
- d) distinctive subjective experience
- e) interpersonal/interactive orientation
- f) characteristic behavioral and motivational features

(Zinck – Newen 2008: 9).

The focus here will be on how these properties are expressed in language and to what extent it is possible to reconstruct the concept of ENVY from its linguistic encodings.

## 1.2. Envy

Envy (not to be confused with jealousy, see e.g., Ben-Ze’ev 2000, Strongman 2005 or Ogarkova 2007) belongs among the emotions directed at the (seemingly undeserved) good fortune of others. Central to envy is the element of social comparison, for the emotion stems from one’s perceived inferiority caused by a(n allegedly unfair) gain of another (Ben-Ze’ev 2000: 281, 284). Strongman (2005: 140) defines envy as “a desire to have what someone else has, whether this be a possession or a personal attribute or characteristic”. Envy is, however, a partial emotion. It addresses only those people whose fortune is in any way relevant to one’s self-esteem (Ben-Ze’ev 2000: 285). It is also relatively prototypical. In a study investigating the prototypicality of emotion concepts it scored 13 in the rating of twenty target emotions (Fehr – Russell 1984: 472).

In the classification of emotions proposed by Zinck and Newen (2008), envy finds itself among secondary cognitive emotions dependent on “cultural information and personal experience” (Zinck – Newen 2008: 14). Envy is, therefore, an emotion which involves complex cognitive processing (i.e. consideration of one’s beliefs, the evaluation of a situation and expectations with regard to the future) (Zinck – Newen 2008: 14). Apparently, next to shame and jealousy, envy is also a derivative of fear (Zinck – Newen 2008: 13, 18), the fear of not granting or securing the object of one’s envy frequently being pointed out as one of the components of the concept in question (Ben-Ze’ev 2000; Strongman 2005; Zinck – Newen 2008).

## 2. The emotion talk of ENVY: A diachronic cognitive approach

### 2.1. The aim

The paper offers a comparative analysis of a native Middle English emotion term *onde* < OE *anda* and its French-derived counterpart *envy* from the point of view of diachronic cognitive linguistics. The pair *onde* ~ *envy* is one of the many duplications that arose in English after the Norman Conquest. Before the native word finally succumbed (c. 1525), the two emotion terms continued in use for nearly two and a half centuries (*OED*). The aim of the present contribution is, essentially, to answer the question whether there were any reasons (such as similarities in their construal) behind the replacement of *onde* by *envy* other than the latter coming from the more prestigious language. Given the social constructionist outlook on emotions (Averill 1980; Harré 1986; Ratner 1989, 1997), assuming their dependence on social norms as well as their considerable cultural specificity (see Elfenbein – Ambady 2002 for the concept of *emotional dialects*), this idea does not seem all that unreasonable.

### 2.2. The corpus and the method

The study has been conducted within the framework of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (CMT) (see, e.g., Kövecses 1998; Lakoff – Kövecses 1987; Lakoff – Johnson 1980) and it falls in the tradition of diachronic emotionology (e.g., Diller 1994a,b, 2002, 2007; Tissari 2001, 2003, 2004; Fabiszak – Hebda 2007), i.e. the study of descriptions of emotions from a historical perspective. The contextual analysis of the lexemes in question was conducted on the basis of data drawn from the Middle English part of *The Helsinki corpus of English texts: Diachronic and dialectal* (608, 800 words). However, since the search for various spelling variants of ME *onde* and *envy*<sup>2</sup> did not return a satisfactory number

---

<sup>2</sup> The spelling variants searched for in the corpus included: OE-eME *anda*, IOE-eME *ande*,

of hits, additional 41 ME texts were investigated (see Table 1 for details). The texts represent different dialect continua in order to increase the representativity of the material.

Table 1. Selected ME texts used for the purpose of qualitative analysis

Dialect	Early ME (1100-1300)	Late ME (1300-1500)
N		<i>Benedictine rule</i> (Lnsd 378 & Vsp A. 25) <i>Works By Rolle</i> <i>Mandeville's Travels</i> (Egerton 1982) <i>Pricke of conscience</i> (Glb E. ix & Hrl) <i>Wars of Alexander</i> (Ashmole 44)
EM	<i>The Peterborough Chronicle 1070-1154</i> (LdMisc 636) <i>Trinity Homilies</i> (Trin-C B.14.52) <i>Lambeth Homilies</i> (Lambeth 467) <i>Vices and virtues</i> (Stw 34) <i>Ormulum</i> (Jun 1)	<i>Merlin</i> (Cmb Ff.3.11) <i>Confessio Amantis</i> (Frf 3) <i>Mandeville's Travels</i> (Cotton Titus C. XVI) <i>Towneley Plays</i> (Hnt HM 1) <i>Guy of Warwick</i> (Auchinleck)
WM	<i>Hali Meidenhad</i> (Bodley 34) <i>Poema Morale</i> (Lamb 487) <i>St. Juliana</i> (Bodley 34)	<i>Cleanness</i> (Nero A. 10) <i>Pearl</i> (Nero A. 10) <i>Destruction of Troy</i> (Htm 388) <i>Gawain</i> (Nero A. 10) <i>Joseph of Arimathie</i> (Vernon)
SW	<i>Layamon's Brut</i> (Caligula A. 9) <i>Hali Maidenhad</i> (Titus D. 18) <i>Owl and nightingale</i> (Clg A. 9 & Jes-O 29) Wintenev version of <i>Benedictine rule</i> (ClD D. 3) <i>St. Juliana</i> (Royal 17.A.27) A moral ode ( <i>Egerton 613</i> )	<i>St. Editha</i> (Fst B. 3) <i>Castle of love</i> (Vernon) <i>Cato</i> (Vernon) <i>Harley lyrics</i> (Harley 2253) <i>Psalter Mariae</i> (Vernon)
SE	<i>Kentish sermons</i> (LdMisc 471)	<i>Ayenbite of Inwyt</i> (Arundel 57) <i>Shoreham</i> (Add 17376)

All the tokens of *onde* and *envy* extracted from the Helsinki Corpus (and the texts listed in Table 1) were processed by means of the Antconc, freeware concordancer software. Once the wordlist had been prepared, the contextual analysis followed. It began with identifying conceptual metaphors of ENVY attested in the investigated data, the assumption being that the analysis of emotion vo-

ME *honde*, ME *oende*, ME *ond*, ME *onde*, ME *oonde*, ME *ounde*; 3-7 *envie*, *envye*, (4 *envi*, *enevi*, *envye*, *enwie*, 5 *inwy(e)*, 4-6 *invy*), 3- *envy* (*MED*, *OED*).

cabulary used by a given community at a given point in time might reveal how the underlying emotion system was structured. Next, the “profiles” for *onde* and *envy* that emerged in the course of data processing were compared to each other and to the scenario for ENVY proposed by Ben-Ze’ev (2000).

### 2.3. The analysis

#### 2.3.1. Middle English *onde*

The Middle English *onde* < OE *anda* is first attested in the 9<sup>th</sup> century in the senses ‘strong feeling against a person, animus; spite, hatred, *envy*’ (early in Old English also ‘fear, terror’) as well as ‘strong positive feeling; zeal, fervent devotion; desire’ (*OED*). Only the sense ‘envy’ is of interest to the present study and in that sense *onde* continues until a1525 when it dies out, having competed against the French-derived *envy* for nearly two and a half centuries (*OED*).

*Onde* appears in the investigated material 87 times and it is almost evenly distributed among different text-types, as shown in Table 2, below.

Table 2. The distribution of *onde* in the analysed material<sup>3</sup>

	Documents & histories	Religious & philosophical	Fiction & private letters
<i>onde</i>	29	36	22

Quite naturally, in religious texts *onde* is mostly viewed as one of the Capital Vices, resident in one’s heart:

- (1) Ah þah meiden beo wið unbruche of þi bodi. & tu habbe prude. *onde* oðer wreaððe. ʒisceunge oðer wac wil inwið heorte; þu forhorest te wið þe unwiht of helle.

(CMHALI)

- (2) And swo forgiue us ure gultes. swo we don hem here þe us agult habbeð. Ne mai no man þese word seggen þanne he godes milce bisecð. gief he haueð on his heorte *onde*. oðer nið.

(CMTRINIT)

<sup>3</sup> The texts have been classified into three major genres (depending on their subject matter), i.e. (1) legal texts and histories (including documents, laws and histories); (2) religious and philosophical texts (comprising religious and philosophical treatises, Bible translations, sermons, the lives of saints, and convent rules), and (3) fiction and private letters (inclusive of non-religious poems, travelogues, romances, tragedies and private correspondence). The classification follows that of Fabiszak – Hebda (2007).

Being a Cardinal Sin, envy was considered an extremely serious trespass against God. In *Ancrene Riwe* *onde* is termed a “spiritual vice” (used by God to test anchoresses) and appears next to pride, “the most dreadful sickness of all”:

- (3) 3ef godd fondeð ancre wið ei uuel utewið. oðer þe feond inwið wið gasteliche unþeawes. ase Prude. Wreaððe. *Onde* oðer wið flesches lustes; ha haueð þt fallinde uuel.

(CMANCRE)

One can only speculate as to how dangerous envy was believed to be (in the context of prospective salvation), given that in the *Lambeth Homilies* it is likened to a weapon (and portrayed as a spear) with which one may be wounded:

- (4) We a3en to understonden hwet boð þe wepne þet adam wes mide forwunded. mid þa ilke wepne we boð forwunded. mid spere of prude. of 3itcunge. of 3ifernesse. of eorre. of hordome. mid *onde*. mid aswolkenesse. þis boð þa wepne þet adam was mide forwunded.

(CMLAMBET)

That *onde* could harm a man physically, according to popular belief, follows also from it being construed as a sickness (consuming one from the inside) or a hungry animal eating one’s heart:

- (5) 3et 3ef þu wite wult hwi we weorið meast rihtwise þeines? Ich þe onswerie. for *onde* þt et aa & eauer ure heorte.

(CMMARGA)

Interestingly, not unlike nowadays, *onde* was directed at another human being (Ben-Ze’ev 2000), the object of desire being either personal goods or qualities:

- (6) For euere in strong penaunce i-nou3 : is lif he gan lede,  
And treuliche heold up holi churche : and wuste hire fram ech wou3.  
þare-fore hadde þe deuel of helle : to him *onde* i-nou3:  
he bi-gan for-to a-rere kontek : bi-tweone him a-non  
And þe king hanri þat was þo : þe kinges sone Ioan.

(CMSELEG)

*Onde* itself is, by the way, presented here as an object that one (be it the Devil or a man) possesses (and stores in their heart):

- (7) gief he haueþ on his heorte *onde*...

(*Trinity Homilies*)

Even though the default container for *onde* is apparently one's heart, *onde* likewise can serve as a container or bounded space, as suggested by the prepositions *in* and *through*:

- (8) But in pride & tricchery In nythe & *onde* & lecchery And in vntolde synnes fele...

(*Cursor Mundi*)

- (9) For þat desturbet charyte, In *onde* man to brynge...

(Shoreham)

- (10) þurch *onde* com deap in to þe worelde

(*Trinity Homilies*)

Like other emotions, or emotions in general, *onde* is construed as a natural force and, consequently, difficult to control or overcome:

- (11) þis woreld þe oreguil and þe wrapþe of kinges. and of barones þe senden here sergantes to bringen iuele tþinges. and þer mide dreuen þat lond þat is to water nemned. and bringen on þe folkes heorte grete stormes. of niþ. and of *onde*. and of hatienge.

(*Trinity Homilies*)

As such, *onde* is a pitiful weakness to be ashamed of:

- (12) ... Aschamed with a pitous *onde*...

(*Confessio Amantis*)

Summing up, for a speaker of Middle English the addressee of one's *onde* was usually another person, the object of unfulfilled desire being either the other's (undeservedly obtained) possessions (e.g., their land) or personal qualities. *Onde* was located in one's heart and it could consume "the host" (i.e. the experiencer) from the inside like a disease, or wound them like a weapon. At the same time, the emotion itself was conceptualised as a container or bounded space and, given the nature of emotions, just as difficult to control. Table 3, below, lists the conceptual metaphors motivating the use of *onde* attested in the data.

Table 3. The CMs of *onde*


---

EXISTENCE OF EMOTION IS POSSESSION OF AN OBJECT
EMOTION IS A CONTAINER/BOUNDED SPACE
HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTION
EMOTION IS A NATURAL FORCE
EMOTION IS A LIVING ORGANISM (HUNGRY ANIMAL)

---

How *onde* was presented/construed does not seem to have depended much on the text being religious or not. The idea of *onde* being an object or a container appears to have been relatively widespread. Similarly, the idea of *onde* being a sin was not restricted to homilies or the lives of saints:

(13) *Onde* hys a senne of herte...

(Shoreham)

Illustrative of the structure of abstract concepts as they may be, conceptual metaphors are not the only motivation behind that structure. It is possible, for example (by means of the Antconc), to analyse the frequency with which a given word forms meaningful relationships with other lexical items. Table 4 shows the results of the collocate analysis for *onde*.<sup>4</sup>

The data confirm what has been established in the qualitative analysis of *onde*. The list comprises mostly different forms of the verb *to have* (pointing to the EMOTION IS POSSESSION OF AN OBJECT metaphor), different forms of the substantive *man* (the usual addressee of *onde*), and vocabulary related to the concepts of Hell and sin, such as *deuel*, *senne*, *prude* or *wraððe*. The modal verb *scholde* may be indicative of moral discourse, suggesting what people should and should not do. High frequencies of *heorte* and *bodi* provide further evidence for BODY/HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTIONS.

---

<sup>4</sup> Window span from 5L to 5R; min. collocate frequency = 3; function words excluded.

Table 4. *Onde*: The collocate analysis

Rank	Freq	Freq(L)	Freq(R)	Collocate
1.	16	14	2	nið ‘enmity’
2.	9	5	4	is
3.	8	7	1	hadde
4.	7	4	3	habbe
5.	7	7	0	gret
6.	7	3	4	wraððe
7.	6	3	3	londe
8.	6	6	0	haue
9.	5	5	0	deuel
10.	4	3	1	men
11.	4	2	2	alle
12.	4	1	3	al
13.	3	3	0	wes
14.	3	1	2	wende
15.	3	0	3	senne
16.	3	0	3	scholde
17.	3	3	0	prude
18.	3	0	3	monne
19.	3	2	1	man
20.	3	3	0	heorte
21.	3	2	1	habben
22.	3	3	0	bodi

### 2.3.2. Middle English *envy*

Middle English *envy* is a French loanword borrowed into English in the second part of the 13<sup>th</sup> century. The earliest attestation of the word in the sense ‘the feeling of mortification and ill-will occasioned by the contemplation of superior advantages possessed by another’ dates back to 1280 (*OED*). Other potentially relevant senses of *envy* include ‘*pl.* instances of envy; envious feelings, jealousies; rivalries’ (first attested in 1668), ‘*concr.* the object of envy’ (1836), ‘desire to equal another in achievement or excellence; emulation. *obs. rare*’ (1541), and ‘a longing for the advantages enjoyed by another person’ (1723); they were, however, too late to be considered in the present study.

In the corpus *envy* appears 183 times and it is most common in fiction and private letters (see Table 5).

Table 5. The distribution of *envy*

	Documents & histories	Religious & philosophical	Fiction & private letters
<i>envy</i>	46	29	108

In religious texts, *envy* is mostly construed as a vice that ought to be punished and, as expected, one of the deadly sins:

- (14) þat þe saule sal pyn mar bitterly  
 þan ever fyver pyned here mans body.  
 Som sal haf þar, for covatyse,  
 Als þe dropsy to grege þair angwyse.  
 Som sal haf in alle þair lymmes about,  
 For sleuthe, als þe potagre and þe gout.  
 Som, for *envy*, sal haf in þair lymms,  
 Als kylles and felouns and apostyms.  
 Som for ire sal have als þe parlesy,  
 þat yvel þe saul sal grefe gretely.

(CMPRICK)

- (15) Pryde, *invye*, wreth, coveytyse, glotony, lechery and slauth: these ben þe VII Dedly Synmys.

(CMREYNES)

It is conceptualised as a fire burning in one's heart from which one needs God's protection:

- (16) And loke þat þe lowe of *envie* and hateredin ne brenne noht hir herte. Lauerd for his mercy defende vs fra *envie* & hateredin.

(*Benedictine Rule*)

*Envy* is, no doubt, perceived as dangerous and harmful. It is likened to a plant which, like a rose, if not handled with care or kept at a (safe) distance, can inflict injuries with its pricks:

- (17) For swyche nyce foolys, whan þey beþ ydulled in here life, and þey see opere y-ocupied in þe wordle aboute temperal godys, anoon þey haueþ *envye*, and gruccheþ, and bagbyteþ here breþeryn; and so for a lytul stynkynde vielþe, in þe whiche opere beþ defoyled in þe wordle, þey hem-self beþ ismyte wit pryckes of *envye* and biternesse...

(CMAELR3)

And yet, detrimental to one's moral well-being as it may be, like a plant, *envy* seems to be feeble or at least feeble enough to be done away with:

- (18) Breke downe firste pride in bodely berynge, and also with-in thi herte, thynkyng, boostyng, and prikkyng and preysyng of thi silfe and of thi dedis, presumyng of thi silfe, and veynlikyng of thi silfe, of eny thyng that God hath sent the, bodili or gostely. Breke downe also *envy* and Ire ayene thyne even cristen, wheþer he be riche or pore, goode or badde, that þou hate hym nott, ne haue disdeyne of hym wilfully, nethir in worde, ne in dede.

(CMROLLTR)

In non-religious texts *envy* is seen not so much as a sin as a malady, a vice or an adversary who is best dead:

- (19) Therof he takth his maladie:  
That vice is cleped hot *Envie*.

(*Confessio Amantis*)

- (20) But considre wel that I ne usurpe not to have founden this werk of my labour or of myn engyn. I n'am but a lewd compiler of the labour of olde astrologiens, and have it translaid in myn Englissh oonly for thy doctrine. And with this swerd shal I sleen *envie*.

(CMASTRO),

charity being its main opponent and the rescue therefrom:

- (21) He can nocht soffre himself be wel.  
*Envie*, which is loveles,  
And Pride, which is laweles,  
With such tempeste made him erre,  
That charite goth out of here...

(*Confessio Amantis*)

- (22) Ayein *Envie* is Charite,  
Which is the Moder of Pite...

(*Confessio Amantis*)

- (23) How that thou miht *Envie* flee,  
Aqueinte thee with charite,  
Which is the vertu soveraine...

(*Confessio Amantis*)

The personification of *envy* as a foe exemplified above is not its only instance, though. The emotion is also depicted as a proud leader standing at the head of a troop of knights:

- (24) Wherof gret werre tho began  
 Among hem that the Regnes hadde,  
 Thurgh proud *Envie* which hem ladde  
 Til it befell ayein hem thus...

(*Confessio Amantis*)

Finally, and this is what religious and non-religious sources have in common, *envy* is viewed as a fire with which one's heart is burning and of which the heart is the trigger:

- (25) ...and he above  
 Stod and behield the lusti love  
 Which ech of hem to other made  
 With goodly chiere and wordes glade,  
 That al his herte hath set afyre  
 Of pure *Envie*...

(*Confessio Amantis*)

As regards the objects of *envy*, texts again (depending on their subject matter) group mostly around virtues or God's grace (religious) and welfare or achievements (non-religious):

- (26) And trewly he rewlyd and maynteyned the right of Holy Churche. And therefore the devyll of helle had grete *envy* vnto hym for his *holy guydyng* and sette debate betwene the kyng and hym, the which kyng was Kyng Harry, y=t= was Kyng Johns sonne.

(CMEDMUND)

- (27) And þow xalt faryn wel, dowtyr, in spyte of alle thyn enmys; þe mor *envye* thei han to þe for my [*gr*]{*ace*, þe bettyr xal I lofe þe. I wer not rygthful God but [*I louy*]{*d* þe, for I knowe þe bettyr þan þow dost þi-self, what- [*þat-euyr men*]{ seyn of þe.

(CMKEMPE)

- (28) ...for his welfare  
 Is whanne he wot an other care:  
 Of that an other hath a fall,  
 He thenkth himself arist withal.  
 Such is the gladschipe of *Envie*

In worldes thing, and in partie  
 Fulofte times ek also  
 In loves cause it stant riht so.

(*Confessio Amantis*)

Table 6 lists the conceptual metaphors manifested in the use of *envy* found in the analysed material.

Table 6. The CMs of *envy*

---

EXISTENCE OF EMOTION IS POSSESSION OF AN OBJECT
HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTION
ENVY IS FIRE (AS A SPECIFICATION OF INTENSITY OF EMOTION IS FIRE)
PERSONIFICATION (E.G., ENVY IS AN ADVERSARY)
EMOTION IS A LIVING ORGANISM (A PLANT)

---

It seems, then, that for speakers of Middle English *envy* was either a sin, a fiend to be fought or a fire consuming one's heart. In any case, *envy* was harmful and as such best avoided. Table 7 presents the results of the collocate analysis for *envy*.<sup>5</sup>

Table 7. *Envy*: The collocate analysis

Rank	Freq	Freq(L)	Freq(R)	Collocate
23.	27	26	1	hadde
24.	25	13	12	is
25.	23	18	5	greet
26.	16	10	6	was
27.	13	2	11	has/hath
28.	13	5	8	be
29.	12	6	6	al
30.	9	7	2	haue
31.	8	6	2	fulle
32.	8	4	4	sal
33.	8	3	5	pride
34.	6	0	6	wald
35.	6	3	3	evere
36.	6	5	1	ire
37.	6	5	1	love
38.	6	4	2	noght
39.	6	0	6	tene

<sup>5</sup> Window span from 5L to 5R; min. collocate frequency = 3; function words excluded.

40.	6	1	5	wreth
41.	5	2	3	air
42.	5	0	5	man
43.	4	4	0	men
44.	4	2	2	porture
45.	4	4	0	quident
46.	4	1	3	tricherie
47.	4	4	0	vice
48.	3	1	2	am
49.	3	1	2	are
50.	3	2	1	bar
51.	3	0	3	brak
52.	3	3	0	fals
53.	3	2	1	hadden
54.	3	1	2	han
55.	3	2	1	herte
56.	3	3	0	Iuus
57.	3	1	2	mai
58.	3	0	3	make
59.	3	0	3	more
60.	3	3	0	neuer
61.	3	3	0	pure
62.	3	1	2	put
63.	3	1	2	son
64.	3	3	0	touchende
65.	3	3	0	weie
66.	3	2	1	wel

The results obtained for *envy* resemble those obtained for *onde* in that the frequencies of particular items in the table reflect the essential characteristics of *envy*, i.e. its being directed at people (*man*, *men*), being considered a vice or a sin (the term frequently occurs in the vicinity of such lexemes as *ire*, *pride*, *wreth*, *tricherie* etc.), and being stored in one's heart (*herte*). *Envy* differs from *onde*, however, in that it seems to collocate more often with intensifiers such as *greet*, *fulle*, *more*, *wel*, which (similarly to the FIRE metaphor) stress the intensity of the emotion.

3. *Onde* vs. *envy*

*Onde* and *envy* both continued in use for about two hundred and fifty years after the latter had been borrowed. For none of them was ‘envy’ the primary sense (*OED*).<sup>6</sup> Yet, *envy* survived and *onde* succumbed. The contextual analysis of the two terms shows that there was a considerable overlap between them, see Table 8 below.

Table 8. Conceptual metaphors: *Onde* vs. *envy*

onde	envy
EXISTENCE OF EMOTION IS POSSESSION OF AN OBJECT	EXISTENCE OF EMOTION IS POSSESSION OF AN OBJECT
HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTION	HEART IS A CONTAINER FOR EMOTION
EMOTION IS A LIVING ORGANISM (HUNGRY ANIMAL)	EMOTION IS A LIVING ORGANISM (A PLANT)
EMOTION IS A NATURAL FORCE	EMOTION (ENVY) IS FIRE
EMOTION IS A CONTAINER/BOUNDED SPACE	ENVY IS AN ADVERSARY (PERSONIFICATION)

Both *onde* and *envy* were conceptualised as residing in the heart, their detrimental effect on the experiencer being indisputable. Both lexemes represented an emotion perceived as a living organism (even though in the case of *onde* that organism was a hungry animal, and in the case of *envy* – a plant). Both *onde* as well as *envy* were morally questionable (vices/sins) and experiencing them was viewed as possessing an object. Finally, both were addressed at another human being and evoked by the perceived inferiority on the part of the experiencer resulting from the other’s undeserved good fortune, be it related to their goods, achievements or God’s grace. This ties in nicely with how Ben-Ze’ev (2000) sees the causes of ENVY, which in his opinion “involves a negative evaluation of our undeserved inferiority ... [being] concerned with a change in what one has ... [i.e.] the wish to obtain” (Ben-Ze’ev 2000: 281).

On the other hand, while *envy* was personified (an adversary) and conceptualised as a fire, *onde* was construed as a sickness, a weapon (a spear), bounded space (*in onde*), and an uncontrollable natural force (a storm). What follows, the metaphor spectrum of *onde* seems to have been wider than that of *envy*,<sup>7</sup> different metaphors pointing to certain differences in the construal. Even though the FIRE and WEAPON metaphors both highlight the aspect of danger involved in experiencing envy, the SICKNESS and NATURAL FORCE metaphors stress the

<sup>6</sup> Interestingly, early in Old English *anda* (ME *onde*) appears in the sense ‘fear’ (*OED*). Zinck and Newen (2008) see *envy* as a derivative of fear.

<sup>7</sup> The imbalance may be due to a particular composition of the corpus.

helplessness of the experiencer,<sup>8</sup> while the FIRE metaphor brings to the foreground the intensity of the emotion.

*Onde* and *envy* also do not pattern alike as far as the genre distribution is concerned. The former predominates in religious discourse; the latter is more frequent in fiction and documents. That the difference is statistically significant follows from the Chi-square test, the P value being less than 0.0001. The high frequency of the borrowed lexeme in non-religious texts may be due to a gradual (post-Conquest) shift in people's interests. Not only did the Norman Conquest bring with itself a new language but also a different social structure and culture (including new titles, customs, types of entertainment<sup>9</sup> and clothing). It is possible that with the new objects of envy in the picture, *onde* was felt to be inadequate in non-religious contexts.

#### 4. Conclusions

The main objective of the present paper was to investigate two emotion terms, i.e. *onde* and *envy* from the point of view of diachronic cognitive linguistics and find the motivation behind the replacement of the native lexeme by the loan. Obviously, the first reason that comes to mind is the relation between English and French, the latter being regarded as more prestigious and sophisticated, which may have been relevant for a subject matter as elusive as emotions are. It seems possible, however, that the sheer prestige of French was not the sole reason behind the substitution (even if it was the most important one).

As mentioned before, for neither *onde* nor *envy* was the sense 'envy' their primary meaning (*OED*), which, in a sense, put the two terms on a par and, theoretically, levelled their chances as far as becoming THE ENVY-word in the post-Conquest England was concerned. At the same time, given that the two lexical items represented very similar concepts (and, indeed, the results of the qualitative analysis point to a considerable overlap in their conceptualisation), there was no particular need to keep them both. The said overlap may have, then, contributed to the demise of one of the terms. Other things being equal, that would, naturally, mean a gradual shift towards the more prestigious variant and the subsequent extinction of the native word.

---

<sup>8</sup> It is interesting to note that in the metaphorical conceptualisation of *onde* (predominant in religious texts) the focus is on lack of control on the part of the experiencer. Christianity advocates meekness which can also be viewed as lack of control.

<sup>9</sup> See also Fabiszak's (2001) similar observation on reconceptualisation of JOY.

## References

## PRIMARY SOURCES

- McSparran, Frances – Paul Schaffner – John Latta – Alan Pagliere – Christina Powell (eds.)  
 2006 *Corpus of Middle English prose and verse*, available at: <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/c/cme/browse.html> (date of access November 2009).
- Rissanen, Matti – Merja Kytö – Leena Kahlas-Tarkka – Matti Kilpiö – Saara Nevanlinna – Irma Taavitsainen – Terttu Nevalainen – Helena Raumolin-Brunberg (eds.)  
 1991 *The Helsinki corpus of English texts: Diachronic and dialectal*. Helsinki: The University of Helsinki.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

- Athanasiadou, Angeliki – Elżbieta Tabakowska. (eds.)  
 1998 *Speaking of emotions. Conceptualisation and expression*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Averill, James R.  
 1980 „A constructivist view of emotion”, in: Robert Plutchik – Henry Kellerman (eds.), 305-339.
- Ben-Ze’ev, Aaron  
 2000 *The subtlety of emotions*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chłopicki, Władysław – Andrzej Pawelec – Agnieszka Pokojńska (eds.)  
 2007 *Cognition in language: Volume in honour of Professor Elżbieta Tabakowska*. Kraków: Tertium.
- Damasio, Antonio  
 1994 *Descartes’ error: Emotion, reason and the human brain*. New York: Grosset – Putnam.
- Diller, Hans-Jürgen  
 1994a “Emotions in the English Lexicon: A historical study of a lexical field”, in: Francisco Fernández – Miguel Fuster – Juan José Calvo (eds.), 219-234.  
 1994b “*Anger and wrath*, or: Is ‘opposition’ a useful concept in historical semantics?”, in: Ekaterini Douka-Kabitoglou (ed.).  
 2002 “The growth of the English emotion lexicon: A first look at the *Historical Thesaurus of English*”, in: Katja Lenz – Ruth Möhlig (eds.), 103-114.

- 2007 "Measuring the growth of semantic fields: The case of the English emotion lexicon", in: Władysław Chłopicki – Andrzej Pawelec – Agnieszka Pokojńska (eds.), 574-596.
- Elfenbein, Hillary Anger – Nalini Ambady  
2002 "On the universality and cultural specificity of emotion recognition: A meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin* 128/2: 203-235.
- Fabiszak, Małgorzata  
2001 *The concept of joy in Old and Middle English. A semantic analysis*. Piła: Wyższa Szkoła Bankowa.
- Fabiszak, Małgorzata – Anna Hebda  
2007 "Emotions of control in Old English: Shame and guilt", *Poetica* 66: 1-35.
- Fehr, Beverley – James A. Russel  
1984 "Concept of emotion viewed from a prototype perspective", *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 113/3: 464-486.
- Fernández, Francisco – Miguel Fuster – Juan José Calvo (eds.)  
1994 *English historical linguistics 1992. Papers from the 7<sup>th</sup> International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Valencia, 22-26 September 1992*. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 113). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Harré, Rom  
1986 *Varieties of realism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Holland, Dorothy – Naomi Quinn (eds.)  
1987 *Cultural models in language and thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- James, William  
1884 "What is an emotion?", *Mind* 9: 188-205.
- Kabitoğlu-Douka, Ekaterini (ed.)  
1994 *Logomachia. Forms of opposition in English language / literature. Inaugural Conference Proceedings [1993]*. Thessaloniki: Hellenic Association for the Study of English.
- Kövecses, Zoltán  
1998 "Are there any emotion-specific metaphors?", in: Angeliki Athanasiadou – Elżbieta Tabakowska (eds.), 127-151.
- Kurath, Hans – Sherman Kuhn – Robert E. Lewis (eds.)  
1952-2001 *Middle English dictionary (MED)*, available at: <http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/m/med> (date of access November 2009).
- Lakoff, George – Mark Johnson  
1980 *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

- Lakoff, George – Zoltan Kövecses  
 1987 “The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English”,  
 in: Dorothy Holland – Naomi Quinn (eds.), 195-221.
- Lange, Carl Georg  
 1885 “The mechanism of the emotions” (translated by Benjamin  
 Rand), in: Benjamin Rand (ed.), 672-684.
- LeDoux, Joseph E.  
 1996 *The emotional brain*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Lenz, Katja – Ruth Möhlig (eds.)  
 2002 *Of dyuersitie & chaunge of language. Essays presented to  
 Manfred Görlach on the occasion of his 65<sup>th</sup> birthday*.  
 Heidelberg: Winter.
- Lyons, William  
 1980 *Emotion*. Cambridge – New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Marks, Joel  
 1982 “A theory of emotion”, *Philosophical Studies* 42/1: 227-242.
- Nenonen, Marja  
 2004 *Papers from the 30<sup>th</sup> Finnish Conference of Linguistics,  
 Joensuu, May 15-16, 2003*. (Studies in Languages 39.) Joensuu:  
 University of Joensuu.
- Oatley, Keith  
 1992 *Best laid schemes: The psychology of emotions*. New York:  
 Cambridge University Press.
- Ogarkova, Anna  
 2007 “‘Green-eyed monsters’: A corpus-based study of metaphoric  
 conceptualizations of JEALOUSY and ENVY in Modern English”,  
*metaphorik.de* 13: 87-148.
- Plutchik, Robert – Henry Kellerman (eds.)  
 1980 *Emotion: Theory, research and experience: Vol. I. Theories of  
 emotion*. New York: Academic Press.
- Rand, Benjamin  
 1912 *The classical psychologists*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Ratner, Carl  
 1989 “A Social Constructionist critique of Naturalistic Theories of  
 emotion”, *Journal of Mind and Behavior* 10: 211-230.  
 1997 *Cultural psychology and qualitative methodology: Theoretical  
 and empirical considerations*. New York: Plenum.
- Simpson, John – Edmund Weiner (eds.)  
 1989 *The Oxford English dictionary*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Oxford: Oxford  
 University Press.

- Solomon, Robert  
1976 *The passions: Emotions and the meaning of life*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company Inc.
- Strongman, Kenneth  
2005 *The psychology of emotion*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Tissari, Heli  
2001 “Metaphors we love by: On the cognitive metaphors of LOVE from the 15<sup>th</sup> century to the present”, *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 36: 217-242.  
2003 *LOVEscapes: Changes in prototypical senses and cognitive metaphors since 1500*. (Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki LXII.) Helsinki: Société Néophilologique.  
2004 “Vistas of fear and hope: On metaphors occurring with the English words *fear* and *hope*”, in: Marja Nenonen (ed.), 214-220.
- Zajonc, Robert  
1980 “Feeling and thinking: Preferences need no inferences”, *American Psychologist* 33/2: 151-175.
- Zinck, Alexandra – Albert Newen  
2008 “Classifying emotion: A developmental account”, *Synthese* 161: 1-25.